UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/481,091	01/11/2000	SE-CHANG WON	51152.00003	5176

7590 11/20/2002

GRAHAM & JAMES LLP
801 S FIGUEROA ST
14TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 900175554

EXAMINER
AKKAPEDDI, PRASAD R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2871	

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/481,091	Applicant(s) WON, SE-CHANG
	Examiner Prasad R Akkapeddi	Art Unit 2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 August 2002* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *8* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7, 9-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on *11 January 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 6 (as amended) rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (Kim) (U.S.Patent No. 6,175,396) as originally cited in the Office action dated May 29, 2002.

In Fig. 10, Kim discloses a mounting bracket for assembling an LCD module comprising a vertical portion (72), a first horizontal portion (71) that is substantially perpendicular to a first end of the vertical portion and a second horizontal portion (73) that is substantially perpendicular to a second end of the vertical portion. The recited limitation 'for supporting the front frame' is for intended use and a front frame is not an element of a mounting bracket. Therefore, the use of a bracket for supporting a frame would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to adapt the mounting bracket for supporting the front frame.

5. (a) Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S.Patent No. 6,175,396) in view of Yun et al (Yun) (U.S.Patent No. 5,835,139).

The claimed limitations 'be coupled to the front frame, and the first horizontal portion is constructed to be coupled to the rear frame' of claim 7, and 'wherein the vertical portion is constructed to be coupled to a monitor case' of claim 9 are considered to be as "intended use" since the front frame, rear frame and the monitor case are not elements of the mounting bracket. Besides, Yun discloses the front frame, rear frame, monitor case for an LCD monitor for a computer. Kim further discloses a second (upper) horizontal portion 73 that is

substantially perpendicular to a second end of the vertical portion 72. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the mounting technique of Kim to enhance (1) the robustness of the display device and (2) to enhance the mechanical fixing strength of the device.

(b) Claims 1-5,12-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Yun et al (Yun) (U.S.Patent No. 5,835,139) and further in view of Kurihara et al (Kurihara) (U.S.Patent No. 5,946,061).

As to claims 1-5: Although Kim discloses a bracket having a vertical coupling portion and a horizontal coupling portion, Kim does not explicitly disclose the LCD device having a first and second frames. Yun on the other hand, discloses a LCD device that includes a liquid crystal module 300 having a first frame 400 and a second frame 190, a rear monitor case 500. Yun further discloses the assembly of this module to the rear monitor case 500, via holes 410a, 410b and coupling members 430. Yun's method of using screws 430 to assemble the liquid crystal display has been further improved by Kurihara and others. Although the use of screws to assemble the LCD device is adequate, further improvements are disclosed by other inventors such as Kurihara, in making the frame more sturdier for better withstanding vibrations and shock due to various operating environments of the module such as mishandling, portability etc.

Instead of using screws to attach the liquid crystal module to the rear monitor case, Kurihara teaches the use of mounting a bracket 12 having a horizontal portion and a vertical portion. Module 11 is shown as a complete assembly having a first frame, a second frame and a liquid crystal panel. Kurihara's module 11 is equivalent to the liquid crystal display device 700 of Yun. Kurihara further discloses a rear monitor casing 14, for encasing the liquid crystal display module 11.

Kurihara further discloses a bracket 13 having a vertical coupling portion 13b and a horizontal coupling portion 13a with one end of the vertical portion being perpendicular to the horizontal portion. When assembled, the brackets 12, 13, the module 11 and the rear monitor case 14 will form the liquid crystal display for a computer.

Kurihara further discloses mounting screw holes 13d and12a for mounting the bracket to the module 11 and mounting holes 13a to the rear monitor case 14. Having mounting holes in the bottom or on the side surface of the rear monitor case is a matter of design choice. In Fig. 2, a cylindrical portion is disclosed on bracket 13, a substantial portion of which is perpendicular to the vertical portion 13b of the bracket 13.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the mounting techniques of Kim and Kurihara to the liquid crystal display device disclosed by Yun to enhance (1) the robustness of the display device (2) to reduce the space required for fixing

the module with the case and (3) to enhance the mechanical fixing strength of the device.

As to claims 12-24: Although, Yun discloses a LCD display device for a computer 600 and a liquid crystal monitor 300, having a LCD panel 300, a back light 110, a rear frame 400 and a front frame 190, a rear monitor case 500, mounting screws 430 and mounting holes 410, Yun does not disclose the use of brackets to assemble the device. However, Kurihara teaches the use of mounting brackets 12 and 13 to enhance the ruggedness of the device.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the mounting techniques of kim and Kurihara to enhance (1) the robustness of the display device (2) to reduce the space required for fixing the module with the case and (3) to enhance the mechanical fixing strength of the device.

5. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Kurihara.

Although, Kim discloses the use of a mounting bracket for a liquid crystal display module, Kim does not explicitly disclose the location of mounting holes on this bracket. Kurihara on the other hand, in disclosing a similar liquid crystal display device, discloses a mounting bracket 12 with a vertical portion 12a, integrally mounted to a horizontal portion of the module 11b where the horizontal portion is substantially perpendicular to the vertical portion. The vertical portion is designed to be coupled to the monitor case 14, via bracket 13. The mounting

holes as shown are design choices and can be placed in any configuration. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the mounting bracket of Kim to the display device disclosed by Kurihara to enhance (1) the robustness of the display device (2) to reduce the space required for fixing the module with the case and (3) to enhance the mechanical fixing strength of the device.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 08/30/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

7. Applicant's argument No. 1: Page 4, lines 20-21 and page 5, line 5: Kim and Yun fails to suggest or teach an 'internal mounting bracket'.

Examiner's response to Argument No. 1: Applicant's claims do not contain an '***internal*** mounting bracket'.

6. Applicant's argument No. 2: The bracket of the invention has a small footprint.

Examiner's response to argument No. 2: Applicant's claims do not contain a ***small footprint***.

7. Applicant's argument No. 3: The panel of Kurihara is held together by latches, not by screws and hence Kurihara teaches away from the invention.

Examiner's response to argument No. 3: Kurihara teaches the use of screw holes 12d, 13d in the first embodiment (Fig. 3) which is the basis of the original rejection. In a

second embodiment as described in Fig. 6, Kurihara teaches the use of latches and hence is not relevant to the original rejection.

8. Applicant's argument No.4: Examiner rejects dependent claims 4 and 14 but fails to reject their base claims 1 and 12 and the Examiner rejects dependent claims 10 and 11 but fails to reject their base claim 6.

Examiner's response to argument No. 4: See the rejection above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prasad R Akkapeddi whose telephone number is 703-305-4767. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM to 5:30PM M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim, who can be reached on 703-305-3492. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0530.

PRA

***

November 12, 2002

ROBERT H. KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800